

Remarks

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the following remarks. For the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention is allowable over the cited references.

The non-final Office Action dated August 11, 2004, indicated that claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112(2); claims 1-2, 7, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Snell* (U.S. Patent No. 6,152,435); claims 1-2, 4, and 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Engibarov* (U.S. Patent No. 5,060,920); claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Engibarov* as applied to claims 1-2, 4, and 7-9 above, and further in view of *McConkey* (U.S. Patent No. 5,074,536); claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Engibarov* as applied to claims 1-2, 4, and 7-9 above, and further in view of *Gaither* (U.S. Patent No. 3,626,600); and claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Engibarov* as applied to claims 1-2, 4, and 7-9 above, and further in view of *Takisawa et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,383,890).

Applicant has amended the claims to better characterize the claimed invention. Claim 1 is now directed to a holder having a guide member including more than one guide for aligning a semiconductor-storing cassette. The amendments to the claims do not add new matter and rather, further characterize the limitations that were already present or implicit in the claims. In view of these amendments and the discussion below, Applicant submits that the claimed invention is allowable over the cited art and requests that each of the rejections be withdrawn.

With respect to the Section 112(2) rejection, Applicant has removed limitations directed to the claimed cassette and believes that the rejection is now moot. Applicant accordingly requests that the Section 112(2) rejection be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully traverses each of the Section 103(a) rejections because the Office Action fails to present evidence of motivation or suggestion that the skilled artisan would use either the '435 or the '920 teachings for holding a semiconductor cassette. The Office Action fails to present any evidence from the references that would indicate that the '435 vice clamp or the '920 jaw assembly could be used to hold cassettes for storing sensitive semiconductor material. The Office Action acknowledges that neither reference teaches using the '435 vice clamp or the '920 jaw assembly to hold a semiconductor storage

cassette and instead ignores these aspects of the claims. Section 103(a) requires that the claims be considered “as a whole” and the Office Action’s disregard of these limitations directed to semiconductor cassettes fails to satisfy this requirement. Without a presentation of the requisite evidence, the Section 103(a) rejections cannot be maintained and Applicant requests that each of the rejections be withdrawn.

Moreover, with particular respect to the rejection of claims 2, 7 and 10 in view of the ‘435 reference, the Office Action fails to present a reference that corresponds to the claimed invention. Regarding claim 2, the Office Action fails to identify how the ‘435 vice clamp is mirror symmetrical with respect to the side facing the base plate and the opposite side facing away from the base plate. At least hole 48 of Fig. 1A would appear to destroy any such symmetry. Regarding claim 7, the Office Action fails to identify how the ‘435 vice clamp guide member “adjoins a single side of the cassette” as claimed. Regarding claim 10, the Office Action fails to identify any detection means in the ‘435 vice clamp that signals that the cassette is present in the holder. Without a presentation of evidence from the cited reference or of correspondence to each of the claimed limitations, the Section 103(a) rejection of claims 1, 2, 7 and 10 cannot be maintained. Applicant accordingly requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

With particular respect to the Section 103(a) rejection of claims 1-2, 4 and 7-9 in view of the ‘920 reference, Applicant respectfully traverses because the Office Action fails to present a reference that teaches each of the claimed limitations. The Office Action fails to identify where the ‘920 reference teaches at least an end portion having a side of the guide member facing toward a base plate being tapered so as to form the protruding end portion, as claimed. The cited portion of the ‘920 reference shows half circle 29 in Fig. 7 cut out of an alleged guide member on a side facing perpendicular to the base plate, not toward the plate. Fig. 9 also fails to correspond to these limitations as cut-outs 66 and 68 merely replace the single cut-out 29 of Fig. 7. Without a presentation of correspondence to each of the claimed limitations, the Section 103(a) rejection cannot be maintained.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Section 103(a) rejection of claim 3 because the Office Action fails to present a combination of references that corresponds to the claimed invention. As discussed above, the ‘920 reference fails to teach the claimed tapering of a side facing toward a base plate. Therefore, modifying the tapering taught by the ‘920 reference would still fail to correspond to the claimed invention. Moreover, the cited ‘536

teachings are not configurable with the '920 teachings. Applicant fails to recognize how the tapered mandrel of the '536 reference would be used to modify the recessed portions of the '920 jaw (22 or 64). Without a presentation of correspondence to each of the claimed limitations, the Section 103(a) rejection cannot be maintained.

Applicant further traverses the rejections of claims 5 and 9 in view of the '920 reference for the reasons discussed above. The '920 reference fails to correspond to claimed invention and the modifications proposed by the Office Action fail to overcome these deficiencies.

In view of the remarks above, Applicant believes that each of the rejections has been overcome and the application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any remaining issues that could be readily addressed over the telephone, the Examiner is asked to contact the agent overseeing the application file, Mr. Peter Zawilski, of Philips Corporation at (408) 474-9063.

Please direct all correspondence to:

Corporate Patent Counsel
Philips Intellectual Property & Standards
1109 McKay Drive; Mail Stop SJ41
San Jose, CA 95131

CUSTOMER NO. 24738

By: 

Name: Robert J. Crawford

Reg. No.: 32,122
(VLSI.430PA)